## Case 1:11-cv-05845-LTS-JCF Document 496 Filed 01/12/23 Page 1 of 2



199 Water Street New York, NY 10038 (212) 577-3300 https://www.legalaidnyc.org/

Via ECF

January 12, 2023

The Honorable Laura Taylor Swain United States District Court for the Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, NY 10038

Re: Nunez v. City of New York, 11 Civ. 5845 (LTS)

Alan Levine President

Twyla Carter Attorney-in-Chief Chief Executive Officer

Justine M. Luongo Chief Attorney Criminal Practice

Mary Lynne Werlwas *Director* Prisoners' Rights Project

## Chief Judge Swain:

Plaintiffs write to request a short extension of the deadline to file a motion for contempt in order to afford the parties more time to meet and confer on disputed issues. The original deadline set by this Court was January 17, 2023. ECF No. 494. Plaintiffs request an extension of slightly more than one week, until January 25, 2023, and the revised briefing schedule below. This is Plaintiffs' first request for an extension of time on this motion. Defendants state that they "consent to the revised briefing schedule should the court still deem it appropriate for plaintiffs to file a motion at this time. Defendants continue to maintain that a contempt motion is not warranted." Proposed schedule:

Plaintiffs' Opening Brief: January 25, 2023 Defendants' Response Brief: February 8, 2023 Plaintiffs' Reply Brief: February 15, 2023

The Monitor's status report would still be filed on February 3, 2023, as currently contemplated by the Court's schedule; the Monitor further consents to Plaintiffs' extension request.

The reason for this request is to allow the parties more time to work toward potential resolution of a disagreement that arose during our conferrals regarding Defendants' calculations of the "24 hour" policy, which Defendants discuss in detail in their recently filed status report to the Court. See ECF No. 495 at 1-3. Plaintiffs believe Defendants' "stop the clock" policy violates the Court's Second Remedial Order, which does not allow for any exception to the 24-hour limit on stays in intake pens. The 24-hour limit ensures that incarcerated people have access to a bed, regular meals, medications, and have their other basic needs met within 24 hours of coming into Department custody, thus preventing the numerous problems, including use-of-force incidents, that arise from long intake stays.

Plaintiffs have provided Defendants with a proposal regarding modifications to the Second Remedial Order that would allow for a more limited version of the clock-stop policy. Defendants have requested additional time to consider this proposal, and would not be able to respond to it before the current motion deadline of January 17. Rather, the parties have agreed to meet and confer

again regarding the issue of the clock-stop policy on January 19, 2023. To facilitate the potential resolution of the disputed issues, or at least narrowing issues that must be presented to the Court in a contempt motion, Plaintiffs seek this adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ /s/

Mary Lynne Werlwas
Debra L. Greenberger
David Billingsley
Jonathan Abady
Katherine Haas
Nairuby Beckles
Sana Mayat

EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF
THE LEGAL AID SOCIETY ABADY WARD & MAAZEL LLP
PRISONERS' RIGHTS PROJECT

Counsel for Plaintiff Class